**MINUTES**

***October 23, 2013***

***3:00 -5:00 p.m.***

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

ROLL CALL

Present:

Andrew Adams, Kia Asberg, David Belcher, Shawn Collins, Chris Cooper, Yang Fan, Patricia Foley, George Ford, Katy Ginanni, Mary Jean Herzog, Beth Huber, David Hudson, Leroy Kauffman, Rebecca Lasher, Will Lehman, Beth Lofquist, David McCord, Erin McNelis, Justin Menickelli, Steve Miller, Leigh Odom, Malcolm Powell, Kathy Starr, Wes Stone, Vicki Szabo, Karyn Tomczak, John Whitmire.

Members with Proxies:

AJ Grube, Lisa Bloom

Members Absent:

None

Recorder:

Ann Green

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Approval of the Minutes

Motion:

The minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of September 26, 2013 were approved as presented.

**EXTERNAL REPORTS\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

Chancellor’s Update/David Belcher:

Dr. Belcher reported to Faculty Senate on the topic of the parking budget and parking permit fees. A copy of the report was distributed to campus via email and the full report is attached as Attachment 1.

Mary Jean shared that a representative from Faculty Senate will serve on the parking committee, including faculty staff and student representatives. Dr. Belcher added that there are such representatives on the committee now, but the enhanced presence will be helpful. Dr. Belcher asked for feedback and discussion ensued. Rebecca Lasher will serve as Faculty Senate representative on the parking committee. Dr. Belcher thanked everyone for their understanding and comments.

Dr. Belcher shared that he is ecstatic about Dr. Alison Morrison-Shetlar accepting the position of Provost and welcomed Dr. Tim Metz, WCU’s new Assistant Vice Chancellor for Institutional Planning and Effectiveness. Tim comes from Campbell University where he had the same role there.

SGA/Colton Overcash, Faculty Senator with SGA:

No report given.

Staff Senate/Robin Hitch:

No report given.

**COUNCIL REPORTS\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

Academic Policy and Review Council (APRC)/David Hudson, Chair:

David gave an overview of when curriculum is required to be voted on by Senate and explained that all curriculum coming to Senate is open for discussion.

The minor in Residential Environments is being proposed for deletion and requires a vote by Senate. There were no other items that were brought to attention for information or as needing discussion.

**VOTE ON DELETING RESIDENTIAL ENVIRONMENTS MINOR**

Yes: Unanimous

No: None

Abstain: None

The vote passed.

David explained that the university wide General Education proposals are in play now with the Liberal Studies Committee (LSC) and University Curriculum Committee (UCC). The committees have met. Letters have come out from Chairs Brent Kinser and Enrique Gomez (chairs of the LSC and UCC respectively) looking for final comments on the proposal. The next stage will be to send out a more involved notice to the college curriculum committees to review and provide comments. Modifications will be made based on comments and it is expected by early spring they will bring forth the proposal with changes and an implementation plan. David encouraged everyone and the colleges to look the proposals and make last comments.

Lowell Davis and Larry Hammer met with APRC to give an overview of some of the changes and policies regarding fostering student success. A document is available on SharePoint with new language for some of the policies. David explained that the Senate will vote on the changes next month. Lowell Davis was on-hand to give an overview to Senate and answer questions. Lowell explained that there are three GA mandates that relate to fostering student success. These are:

1. The number of credit hours that a student may withdraw from during their tenure at any UNC public institution is 16 credit hours. Anything over 16 credit hours will result in a “W-F” which will be calculated as an F in their cumulative and semester GPA,

2. The good academic standing policy currently states a student must have a 2.0 GPA or above to be in good academic standing. The new policy adds to this by requiring students must have a 2.0 cumulative GPA and successfully complete at least 67% of their attempted hours.

3. All students will be warned if their completion rate falls below 67%.

Financial aid already has a requirement of 67%. This will bring financial aid and academics together.

Lowell also explained you can have a student with a 3.0 or above GPA, but if based on the total number of hours in the semester, if they fail or withdraw from a course, their completion rate may end up at below 67%.

The withdrawal for medical reasons policy currently allows students to withdraw from an individual course for medical reasons. The language being proposed is that students have to withdraw from all courses for medical reasons and that it will rest with the Student Health Center and Psychological and Counseling Services. Students will send the documentation to these two centers for review and these entities will determine whether or not the student should be withdrawn from the university for medical reasons. In the event a student may need to withdraw from one particular course,

(i.e. if a student breaks his arm and can no longer play a musical instrument and may need to withdraw from one music course; the student will need to petition the dean of the college to withdraw from the one course for a medical withdrawal). The shift is instead of withdrawing from individual courses for medical reasons with the faculty member checking on the form medical or administrative related, this will move to an all or nothing policy with health services review and determination for medical withdrawal. This is for undergraduate and graduate students.

Q: the 16 hour with withdrawals, is that something that will have a grandfather clause?

A: Yes.

Q: It doesn’t matter when you withdraw? The 2nd day after add/drop or 3 weeks in?

A: All are withdrawals.

Q: Is that cumulative across UNC schools?

A: That’s really not clear. We have a meeting with UNC GA in November. There are a few other things that are not clear…

Q: …the 2 year rule- if those withdrawals come across 2 years and if someone withdrew and then got it together and came back as a student.

A: The academic suspension and dismissal policy that Western currently has will not change. The student will sit out for 2 years, I’m of the understanding that we will evaluate the student’s transcript and that the clock can start over after the 2 year period, but that is something that I will clarify.

Q: What is our current, how many hours currently can students withdraw from?

A: All of them…

Q: What is the rationale bringing it to 16?

A: There are a lot of different….some students decide to sign up for 18 credit hours and decide to go for the first 2 weeks and go to classes and then decide they don’t like a class anymore and will withdraw. (They basically know going in that they will withdraw from a class)…it affects financial aid. If we have students who enroll in courses that they really have intention of withdrawing from, it’s not fair to the dean or to the instructors. We want students to graduate from our institution in 4 years. Our 4 year and 6 year graduation rate needs a little work. If we advise students to take 15 credit hours and advise them to stay in the classes they are enrolled in, we can help them and help Western’s graduation rates to increase…our goal is to assist the students where they need it and help them to graduate from this institution in four years. Withdrawing from courses is not going to get us there.

Q: …it seems to me there’s no room for context in this policy.

A: It’s hard…

Beth Lofquist reiterated that this is a GA mandate.

Q: It’s also a …unclear…we had a lot of discussion over full classes. If you have a 35 seat class, if 2 of those students are in that class, just trying it out, wanting to withdraw and then they do withdraw; those are 2 seats that could have been filled by other students who couldn’t get into that class.

Discussion continued.

Discussion took place on voting on these proposals and if the vote can be no. Beth Lofquist explained that part of these proposals are mandates from GA and that it may be that these really should come as information and parts are things that really can be voted on for action.

An appeals process will be developed for the withdrawal policy.

This concluded the APRC Report.

Add-on: Before the Faculty Senate meeting adjourned, David Hudson added that the academic integrity appeals process was recently talked about. Right now, appeals go to the Academic Integrity Board which is a university wide committee and then the appeal goes back to a college level committee which may or may not exist in several colleges and then it goes to the Provost’s Office. They are trying to re-work the document and revise the policy to take out the college level step and instead go straight to the Academic Integrity Board and then to the Provost’s Office. Beth Lofquist said that she had been involved in the conversation as well and felt like it could come to the Provost Office and that the Provost could consult with the Dean, so the college is involved in it as well. Right now, it goes to Sam Miller of Student Affairs. It could be that it goes to the Provost in consultation with the Dean and Student Affairs - those 3 people.

Collegial Review Council (CRC)/Steve Miller, Chair:

There are two resolutions.

Addition of language in Policy 4.09 – Steve explained that the new language that has been added to 4.06 is in bold, underlined type and is language that quotes UNC Policy 101.3.1 regarding reappointment decisions. This addition will make it clear to candidates what the policy manual sets; that decisions not to reappoint may be made for any reason that is not an impermissible reason. Steve mentioned they will also add a comment that refers to Policy 10 which addresses gender identity and sexual orientation as protected classes. These aren’t named in the UNC Code, but are named in Policy 10. Steve will be bringing this to the council.

Leroy Kauffman read Policy 10 to the group.

Q/C: I feel like the term malice is something that we have talked about a lot…and is so broadly defined…can someone think of an example or reason why someone would deny reappointment based on malice? –(issue with non-reappoint being based on your actions and not on personality type.) Discussion continued, but this issue is not pertinent to the resolution on the table.

**VOTE ON CRC Resolution Addition of Language to 4.09/4.06:**

Yes: Unanimous

No: None

Abstain: None

The vote passed.

The second resolution makes changes to the Faculty Handbook to reflect Library organizational changes and includes changes to three different parts of the Handbook. The Library used to function like a department, but is now organized like a college with departments within it. The language needs to be updated to reflect the organizational changes. The changes are in bold, underlined type on the resolution.

Q/C: …the only thing I’m not sure I understand is the removal of the “client assessments.”

A: I think it’s because they think now with their departmental structure they can they can go more purely on what is exactly in the regular provost guidelines for dossier…

Q/C: And I would suspect they have their own collegial review documents.

A: They do.

Q/C: That they would draw that aspect out…

**VOTE ON CRC Resolution Changes to Handbook language to reflect Library Organizational Changes**

Yes: Unanimous

No: None

Abstain: None

The vote passed.

Steve ended by sharing other issues the council will be looking at which are: 1) what kind of SAI table templates are used and improving how SAI tables are going into people’s dossiers, and 2)proxy voting on CRC committees which happens in some colleges and doesn’t happen in other colleges

Faculty Affairs Council (FAC)/Pattie Foley, Chair

Beth Lofquist came to the Faculty Affairs Council meeting and discussed some changes to faculty awards. There was very good discussion at the Council meeting and they will be re-drafting the document that will be brought up next month as a second motion to Faculty Senate. They want to get the changes implemented by the first of next semester since nominations for awards will begin at the beginning of the semester.

The group will be meeting with Keith Corzine next month and discussing bookstore policies. The FAC has discussed some concerns and Pattie said Keith is excited to be talking with the faculty to address concerns.

Pattie asked that people email her with any issues or questions in case those are not already on their list of things to discuss.

There are other hot topics that the council is working on, but nothing that is ready to bring forward yet.

Rules Committee/Leroy Kauffman, Chair

Leroy reported that the committee met with legal counsel last week going over draft documents on hearing committees and procedures and grievance hearing procedures. They have received back a red-line copy of the documents that they will be looking at. The goal is to distribute the documents before the next Senate meeting early enough to allow everyone to have a chance to look at them. Leroy thinks they have made great strides in making them more understandable and readable. Leroy plans to invite Legal Counsel, Mary Ann Lochner, to the next Faculty Senate meeting to aid in conversation. Some of the information will need to be voted on; some will need to have a hearing for the faculty and this will be explained at the next meeting.

They received a resolution on voting from a member of Senate requesting that all votes be a matter of public record rather than secret voting. There will be material coming forth about this.

For information Leroy let everyone know that the members of the Rules Committee are Leroy Kauffman, Steve Miller, Vicki Szabo, Erin McNelis and Will Lehman. Sharing of perspectives and comments were welcomed. There were none.

Discussion moved to the upcoming proposed resolution on voting. The purpose behind the resolution was explained by the proposer; that senators need to take ownership of votes…that having votes recorded allows those who vote for them to have an idea of what you stand for and believe it. It does create issues with tenure, but it is also the responsibility as a member of Senate – and is the same as we ask of our administrators – to stand up to their decisions and Senators should have to stand up to those too.

Q/C: As a pre-tenure person myself, I understand the concern about public voting. On the other hand, part of the process that we are involved in requires openness and the benefit that a pre-tenure person gets serving on a board like this far outweighs the potential political risk. I think that everyone here respects that there are differences of opinion and I don’t think they’re real risks that someone will get railroaded when going for tenure… It’s a cost, but it’s not a terrible cost…

Q/C: I wonder…interpret the policy that we just voted on, would votes on Senate belong to prohibited category one of exercise of first amendment rights? …would that be something that would explicitly forbid people to make negative tenure or promotion decisions on the basis of…

Q/C: It would be retaliation.

Q/C: …is that an exercise of your first amendment rights and therefore is – interrupted.

Q/C: you are saying that would automatically not be a valid reason for non-reappointment.

Q/C: that’s what I’m wondering.

Q/C: I wouldn’t imagine that anybody would admit that they are voting against someone because of that.

Q/C: But you vote on curriculum issues and things like that – someone could be like “they have a totally wrong vision of curriculum when they voted on Senate”. They voted against our program, they voted against expanding, making this change in our curriculum…whatever…

Discussion continued.

Q/C: …there is provision in the Handbook for requesting a roll call vote; for requesting a secret. I think there is a provision for requesting a roll call vote.

Q/C: …it’s got to be posted somewhere…the idea would be that it would be posted on the Faculty Senate website A necessary piece of this is that it’s got to be posted somewhere, not just here in this room.

Q/C: a part of the minutes

Q/C: yes.

Q/C: I would add that I think theoretically we’re supposed to be representatives of our college and we should have done some good will to try to figure out what people want…

Discussion continues.

**OTHER REPORTS\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

New Business:

None

Old Business:

None

**SENATE REPORTS\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

Administrative Report/Interim Provost Beth Tyson Lofquist:

The Provost’s Report was distributed earlier. Beth thanked Brian Gastle and Steve Miller for their work on meeting with the colleges’ collegial review committees.

Beth has heard about the survey on engaged activities and how laborious it is. It takes a lot of time to complete and to get the richness of information they need for the reapplication for Carnegie. It is important if we want to reclassify ourselves as an engaged institution. The deadline was extended as explained in a recent email. Beth asked that you click on no activity if there is none, but they do need to have the response even if no activity.

They are finally closing in on a plan of support to move the institution forward in implementing Digital Measures as the database for all faculty work. Beth is working on trying to get support out of her office that will work with the colleges and the deans have she hopes talked to department heads about a plan of action for rolling out to the colleges. It will be a phased roll out of two colleges per year until everyone is phased in. Some colleges are already using it. The plan is to get a faculty member that is interested in working with the colleges. This would be a primary role for a faculty member for at least 2-3 years. Beth said there will be a call for nominations and an application process to find a faculty member that is good with the technological side and also with the faculty work side of things.

Beth said there have been a lot of requests for Panopto Video Capture. The deans have supported moving forward with it. There will be a pilot in the spring through Coulter Faculty Commons.

Q/C: Requested a short explanation of what this is.

A: Laura Cruz explained that Panopto is web-based. You can take a video from your house, office, anywhere, of yourself, of your screen, or of a PowerPoint. You click, shoot, stop, compile, edit and load it to blackboard. It’s really, really handy. Laura said demos can be given through Coulter Faculty Commons.

Q/C: Are there space issues?

A: No. We pay by hours of usage.

Q/C: We will be working out of Coulter Faculty Commons to offer this for training.

Q/C: Is it an online teaching tool or a capture tool that you can put up so you can watch a video?

A: It can be used to import videos from anywhere. If you have students that are creating videos and you want to give them a place they can upload to, where you can see them and grade them. This can be a collaboration tool as well. Most others UNC institutions already have this and it is used as much for face to face or you can use it for conferences. It’s not simply for online teaching, although certainly it is rich for that.

Q/C you were talking about Digital Measures, does that include your tenure and promotion?

A from Beth Lofquist: yes. We want this to be a comprehensive process that will work for AFE, Dossier, Delaware Reporting; a comprehensive process where we can pull reports for Carnegie Engaged application process…if we program it right, it will become an easier process for our campus. That’s our goal…

In closing, Beth said that she has three more months as Interim Provost and in some ways this becomes the three hardest months. She will always need to weigh her decisions on whether it is something that needs to move forward now or that really needs to wait for the next person to do. Beth said she is not a place holder and she hopes everyone knows her well enough to know she will try to do the job the best she can and she will continue to do that. She asked that everyone bear with her and asked for our support and patience as we figure out how we need to move forward in this period of transition.

A question was raised about an email received by many department heads about pre-majors from UNC GA. The concern is that 1)probably not a role for a department head without consulting with faculty and 2)what kind of slippery slope is this setting up or are we saying to community colleges feel free to deliver these courses that we promise will be transferred in?

Beth said she had no idea that this email was being sent. It evidently went to department heads without being talked about with provosts. Beth said she has a CAO meeting coming up soon. She will be forwarding the email to Suzanne Ortego at GA to ask about it.

Brian Gastle said he has an email drafted to go out to department heads telling them if they received this email to forward it to Beth and she will follow up with GA. It was confirmed that the instruction to department heads was to not respond to the GA request.

Discussion continued.

Faculty Senate Chair Report/Mary Jean Herzog:

The Chair’s Report was distributed and is posted. Mary Jean asked if there were any questions. She mentioned that Dr. Alison Morrison-Shetlar sent her a message and wanted to thank the Faculty Senate for attending her session while she was on campus.

Mary Jean asked Erin McNelis to talk about the General Education Council and things that are going on with the state.

Erin said if you go to GA’s website (northcarolina.edu) under the heading of Leadership it will get you to Faculty Assembly and the meeting schedule. The schedule for this Friday includes the update and timeline on the Articulation Agreement. It also says under Fall 2013, “Design Pathways to Majors”. This is part of the revised comprehensive articulation agreement. First they decreased the general education component to 30 hours, which was an issue. They are trying to have more directed or guided general education electives toward the major. It sounds like they are trying to do with insisting that people respond to the email which was discussed earlier in this meeting from GA. So it is worth following up on – how is this to be completed with no faculty input or voice other than indirect email from department head.

The General Education Council has been meeting regularly and will finalize their recommendations to President Ross by January, 2014. Their mandate has come from the Strategic Directions document for UNC and they are charged with establishing core competencies and development of assessments for student learning. The council wants to share their recommendations with Faculty Assembly and the faculties at each institution before the recommendations are due to give time for discussion.

The council recommendation will be that there should be two shared competencies: “critical thinking” and “written communication.” These were by far and above the top scores of the UNC faculty surveys. Erin said that conversations are needed and, hopefully a forum will be held, on the topic of assessment. Common assessment is coming.

The Council will need to have a draft instrument by April, 2014 for it to be piloted in Fall of next year. At minimum a quantitative component to the assessment of critical thinking is required. Right now there are five campuses piloting the CLA, Collegiate Learning Assessment Plus, which is a new version of this test that has been around awhile. Western is one of those institutions. Erin explained there is a minimum that you test freshmen and seniors. The test is intended to show value added by the institution. It is important that we make sure the assessments we recommend will not be misleading and they have guidance to those who might use the data to interpret it well. An assessment product can be purchased or one can be developed. The educational testing service has agreed to work to develop a system to be used by all institutions. Right now there is not one assessment used by all UNC institutions. There is a lot to consider in a short time frame.

Questions were raised about costs of assessment. Erin explained that the funding has not been clarified yet; whether the funding will come from the UNC system budgets or students will share in the cost of the assessment tests or what will be the means of funding. Discussion continued.

The meeting adjourned. Attachment 1:

 Faculty Senate

Chancellor’s Report

October 23, 2013

I am using this report opportunity to provide some details about the parking services budget and a **draft proposal** for phased-in increases in parking permit fees over the next few years.  I acknowledge up front that this is an unpopular topic – I get it.  Let me ask, though, that you read this lengthy statement in detail so that you can provide helpful input.

First, a look at the current parking services budget:  WCU’s parking services function is funded through the permit process.  On average, WCU issues 7,000 permits each year.  In addition, the parking services operation generates money through fines, but state law requires that 80% of revenues from fines be transferred to the K-12 System; WCU only keeps 20% of fine revenues.

Here is **a snapshot of the parking services budget**.

Revenues

                $672,000 Parking Permits

                $120,000 Fines

                $792,000 Total Revenues

Expenses

                $415,000 Parking Services Personnel and Operations

                $250,000 Capital Improvements

                $  96,000 Transfer to K-12 System

                $761,000 Total Expenses

Available for Reserve:  $31,000

Brutal Facts

* The current parking configuration doesn’t meet existing peak demand, let alone anticipated future parking needs as revealed by the campus master planning process.
* New and repaving projects are expensive.  Here are costs for 4 new and repaving projects in the last couple of years:
	+ HHS Overflow lot (construction of a gravel lot) - $600,000.
	+ Coulter/Forsyth repaving project - $200,000.
	+ Creek Lot repaving project - $253,450.
	+ Albright-Benton repaving project - $246,651.
* Because WCU’s parking services budget is so small with virtually no reserves, the university has not been able to repave lots in a timely manner.  They have thus deteriorated to such an extent that, when the university does get to the repaving moment, we have to dig up, not just the asphalt, but also the base layer of support for the lot, all of which translates into greater expense.
* Additional state funding is tied almost exclusively to enrollment growth.  That is, in order for WCU to get new funding from the state in the current budget climate, we have to grow our student enrollment.  A larger student enrollment will necessitate more parking, putting further stress on parking infrastructure.
* Bottom line:  the parking services budget does not take care of the current parking infrastructure at a time when the university needs even more, nor does it provide a reserve to help with future projects.
* Status quo is not an option.

Givens

* WCU must establish financial stability for its parking system to meet current and future demand.
* The campus master plan study reveals a need for 2,400 additional parking spaces in the next few years.
* The most efficient and effective solution is a parking garage.

Parking Garage

* A 1,200-space garage would increase parking inventory by almost 20%.
* Construction costs range from $19,000 to $24,000 per parking space.  The higher the cost, the more attractive the facility.
* Total cost for a 1,200-space garage would be $23-29 million.
* Construction would necessitate acquiring a revenue bond for construction – 30 years @ approximately 5% interest.
* Bond covenant would require a 10-15% reserve to borrow money.  That is, WCU must have 10-15% of the cost of the parking garage in hand *before* borrowing the money to build.  Reminder:  WCU has a current reserve of $31,000.

**If WCU is going to tackle the parking dilemma strategically, efficiently, and sustainably, we have to raise parking permit fees.**

Parking Garage Amortization Analysis

Below are two amortization examples and the resulting per-person increase which would be required to fund the parking garage project.  These examples assume that all faculty, staff, and students would pay the same for parking permits which is not what the draft proposal envisions.

1,200 spaces @ $18K/space.

                Cost of Construction - $22 million.

                Annual payment - $1.43 million/year.

                Increase in permit fee - $205 (in addition to current fee of $96).

1,200 spaces @ $24K/space.

                Cost of Construction - $29 million.

                Annual payment - $1.88 million/year.

                Increase in permit fee - $270 (in addition to current fee of $96).

WCU Parking Fees

Most institutions in the UNC System have a range of parking fees; that is, some pay higher or lower fees than others on a single campus.  For each campus there is a “typical” fee, the fee paid by most of the people on the campus.  WCU’s “typical” fee, $96, is the lowest of the 15 institutions in the UNC System.

Immediately above WCU is UNC-A at $100.  Winston-Salem State University is middle of the pack at $260.  UNC-CH has the highest at $883.

A group from the Administration and Finance Division has researched approaches other universities have taken to parking fees.  They considered various options including:

* Parking fees based on salary level.
* Across-the-board fee increases (as we currently do).
* New employees and students paying higher fees than those who are already here.
* Not allowing freshmen to bring cars to campus.
* Pricing permits on a Convenience vs. Cost basis.

While no option is without a down side, the Administration and Finance group proposes the convenience vs. cost model as the best option for WCU to pursue.  According to this model, the closer to the core of campus one parks, the higher the parking permit fee.  The proposal incorporates a 3-tier approach:

1. Top Tier for premium lots located in the core of campus - $400/year.
2. Middle Tier for lots located on the perimeter of the core - $300/year.
3. Bottom Tier for a new lot constructed on the west campus which would be serviced by the shuttle system for regular pick-ups and drop-offs - $200/year.
4. There is a fourth tier for employees on campus who, like I do, have reserved spaces - $500/year.

The proposal suggests a **4-year phase-in of the increased fees**, on top of the current, across-the-board fee of $96, as follows:

1. Top Tier - $76 increase per year:  2014 - $172; 2015 - $248; 2016 - $324; 2017 - $400.
2. Middle Tier - $51 increase per year:  2014 - $147; 2015 - $198; 2016 - $249; 2017 - $300.
3. Bottom Tier - $26 increase per year:  2014 - $122; 2015 - $148; 2016 - $174; 2017 - $200.
4. Reserved - $81 increase per year (over current $175):  2014 - $256; 2015 - $337; 2016 - $418; 2017 - $500.
5. Note:  according to the proposal, there will be a limited number of carpool permits available at the Middle Tier price for parking in top tier lots.

**Night Permit for Faculty, Staff, and Students.**  There is currently no permit required for parking after 5 p.m.  According to the draft proposal, a night permit priced at the Bottom Tier level would be required to park on campus from 4 p.m. to 7 p.m.

**Coulter/Forsyth Parking Lot.** The draft proposal calls for the Coulter/Forsyth parking lot to be closed to permit parking and to institute a multi-meter, pay-and-display approach wherein the motorist parks, walks to the parking pay station, pays by credit card, cash, or CatCard for the amount of parking time desired, and places the receipt on the dashboard of the vehicle.  This would be a 24/7 operation.

I recognize that this is a lot of information to absorb, but it is important to me that the campus community knows about the proposal and has the opportunity to offer feedback and suggestions.  The proposal, in fact, has already been altered in response to suggestions from members of the Chancellor’s Leadership Council.

We certainly welcome feedback on this proposal which you can provide through the campus master planning feedback website:  <http://www.wcu.edu/about-wcu/leadership/office-of-the-chancellor/chancellors-division/oipe/campus-master-planning/share-your-feedback.asp>.  We will also host open forums on this topic in November.

Sincerely yours,

David Belcher

Chancellor